

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 13:53
To: (b)(6) Chief of Chaplains, N097
Cc:

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: Messaging about counseling support for civilians
Attachments: Employee assistance program_Factsheet.pdf

(b)(6)

Thanks for the note. We share your concern here at CNIC -- employees should not be worried about receiving grief counseling in the wake of the WNY shootings. The following information may be useful to your team in getting this word out:

- * The Civilian Employee Assistance Program (CEAP) is mandated by Federal Regulations to give short term non-medical counseling for a wide range of personal issues. The services are provided free of charge to all government civilian employees and are confidential; CEAP counselors cannot release confidential information without the employee's written consent. Attached is a flyer that provides more detail on the program as well as how to access these services.
- * The Federal Occupational Health (FOH) is also on scene providing free and confidential counseling.
- * From the OPM Handbook on EAP Programs: Given the personal nature of visits to the EAP, employees are naturally concerned about the privacy and confidentiality of information maintained by the EAP. Agencies are required to inform employees about the procedures and laws affecting the EAP's system of records. When an employee comes to the EAP for assistance, the EAP staff should provide him or her with a written notice concerning the confidential nature of EAP records along with the conditions where information discussed in counseling may be disclosed; medical emergency, response to an order of a court of competent jurisdiction or with the written consent of the employee.
- * The Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) covers all EAP records. In addition, EAP records of clients with alcohol and drug problems are protected further by 42 CFR 2 Part 2, "Confidentiality of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Patient Records."
- * Depending on the location of the counseling site and the professional background of the EAP counselor, the EAP records may also be protected by state and professional licensing/credentialing laws and regulations. Generally, these laws and regulations prohibit EAP staff from sharing any information about clients to anyone outside of the EAP, without the specific written consent of the client.

Please let me know if you think any additional information is required.

r/(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) Chief of Chaplains, N097
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:48 PM
To: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Messaging about counseling support for civilians

Admirals--

Just as we've worked hard to destigmatize talking to counselors by our uniformed shipmates, we may need to push hard on the same message with our civilian shipmates.

I just received some feedback about a conversation overheard at Sunday's memorial service between civilians about whether they should talk to a counselor, out of concern that doing so would cause them problems with present & future government employment. It may be an isolated incident. Then again, it may not be.

If we can get the chapter & verse on counseling & civilian employment, we can get that message out through all of our communications channels, beginning with commanders & senior civilians, in the days & weeks ahead. I'll be glad to pass it to all chaplains.

Leadership--including civilian leadership--by example will be important. I'm confident we can get the message out effectively.

Vr, (b)(6)

(b)(6) I, CHC, USN

Chief of Chaplains (N097)

2000 Navy Pentagon, Rm. 5E270

Washington, DC 20350-2000

E-mail: (b)(6) SIPR: (b)(6)

Phone: (703) 614-4043 BlackBerry: ((b)(6)) DSN: (312) 224-4043 Fax: (703) 693-2907

www.facebook.com/ChiefofNavyChaplains www.chaplaincare.navy.mil

"Strengthen the Force +++ Engage with Leadership +++ Build the Community"

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic transmission may contain attorney work-product or information protected under the attorney-client privilege, both of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail, please delete it after notifying the sender of erroneous transmission. Do not release outside of DoD channels without prior authorization from the sender.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld



FEDERAL OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Employee Assistance Program

The Federal Occupational Health (FOH) Employee Assistance Program (EAP) helps Federal employees and managers develop the knowledge, skills, and confidence needed to manage life challenges.

In what way does FOH's EAP help employees?

Master's level, credentialed counselors help employees with issues like stress, relationship difficulties, substance misuse, and other health problems. These issues, if left unresolved, can affect employee wellness, productivity, attendance, safety, and morale.

How does the EAP help managers?

Managers often deal with challenging or difficult situations and can benefit from impartial, experienced guidance. FOH's EAP professionals provide information, expert advice, and coaching to help managers respond effectively to employee and organizational concerns.

How can employees access the EAP?

Employees and their family members, both nationally and abroad, can contact our Service Center 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Our expert staff answers calls immediately and treats each caller with the care and discretion they deserve. Employees can also visit the EAP Web site at FOH4You.com, where they will find interactive tools and resources on a wide range of topics.

When there is a crisis or traumatic event, how does the EAP help?

Available day or night, FOH's Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) services are designed to minimize the potential impact of a crisis or traumatic event. Our specialized response team, which has more than 30 years of Federal crisis response experience, helps managers develop crisis preparedness and response plans and responds immediately should a crisis occur.

Can the EAP help with legal and financial matters?

The FOH EAP includes consultation with financial experts and licensed attorneys. Services include living will preparation, health care power of attorney, estate planning, education funding, retirement planning, and investment strategies.

How does the EAP help employees that have alcohol or drug related concerns?

Licensed counselors facilitate group discussions with a focus on education, prevention, and early intervention. In addition, employees with alcohol or drug-related concerns can access our innovative on-line program, Connect4Health.

What are the benefits?

- **Seasoned** and caring professionals
- **Increased** employee morale and reduced absenteeism
- **Support** available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year

"When my agency reorganized, I lost half of the staff in my department. The EAP was an extremely helpful resource during this time of change. The counselor coached me on the most effective ways to address resistance to change and boost morale. The immediate availability of a counselor and the excellent coaching that I received was very valuable."

Federal Human Resources Manager

Fast Facts

- **Excellence** – FOH EAP users report 99 percent satisfaction with counseling services, while 99.5 percent indicate they would recommend the program to others.
- **Accessibility** – Professional counselors are located in more than 80 Federal office buildings nationwide, and a network of providers is available across the U.S. and abroad.
- **Experience** – FOH has more than three decades of EAP and crisis response experience.

We care, just call.
800.457.9808
www.FOH.hhs.gov/FS



(b)(6)

CIV RLISO, NDW

From: (b)(6) BUMED <(b)(6)>
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 14:18
To: (b)(6)
Cc:

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: Messaging about counseling support for civilians

(b)(6)

Also want to ensure that any civilian counseling support personnel don't get caught up in a shutdown. Recognize most is FOH contract, but need to ensure we have a way forward for those civilians providing care and those receiving it in the (hopefully unlikely) prolonged shutdown. VR,(b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) :NIC HQ, N00 [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 01:52 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: Messaging about counseling support for civilians

(b)(6),

Thanks for the note. We share your concern here at CNIC -- employees should not be worried about receiving grief counseling in the wake of the WNY shootings. The following information may be useful to your team in getting this word out:

* The Civilian Employee Assistance Program (CEAP) is mandated by Federal Regulations to give short term non-medical counseling for a wide range of personal issues. The services are provided free of charge to all government civilian employees and are confidential; CEAP counselors cannot release confidential information without the employee's written consent. Attached is a flyer that provides more detail on the program as well as how to access these services.

* The Federal Occupational Health (FOH) is also on scene providing free and confidential counseling.

* From the OPM Handbook on EAP Programs: Given the personal nature of visits to the EAP, employees are naturally concerned about the privacy and confidentiality of information maintained by the EAP. Agencies are required to inform employees about the procedures and laws affecting the EAP's system of records. When an employee comes to the EAP for assistance, the EAP staff should provide him or her with a written notice concerning the confidential nature of EAP records along with the conditions where information discussed in counseling may be disclosed; medical emergency, response to an order of a court of competent jurisdiction or with the written consent of the employee.

* The Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) covers all EAP records. In addition, EAP records of clients with alcohol and drug problems are protected further by 42 CFR 2 Part 2, "Confidentiality of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Patient Records."

* Depending on the location of the counseling site and the professional background of the EAP counselor, the EAP records may also be protected by state and professional licensing/credentialing laws and regulations. Generally, these laws and regulations prohibit EAP staff from sharing any information about clients to anyone outside of the EAP, without the specific written consent of the client.

Please let me know if you think any additional information is required.

r/(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) Chief of Chaplains, N097

Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:48 PM

To: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Messaging about counseling support for civilians

Admirals--

Just as we've worked hard to destigmatize talking to counselors by our uniformed shipmates, we may need to push hard on the same message with our civilian shipmates.

I just received some feedback about a conversation overheard at Sunday's memorial service between civilians about whether they should talk to a counselor, out of concern that doing so would cause them problems with present & future government employment. It may be an isolated incident. Then again, it may not be.

If we can get the chapter & verse on counseling & civilian employment, we can get that message out through all of our communications channels, beginning with commanders & senior civilians, in the days & weeks ahead. I'll be glad to pass it to all chaplains.

Leadership--including civilian leadership--by example will be important. I'm confident we can get the message out effectively.

Vr,(b)(6)

(b)(6) CHC, USN

Chief of Chaplains (N097)

2000 Navy Pentagon, Rm. 5E270

Washington, DC 20350-2000

E-mail: (b)(6) SIPR: (b)(6)

Phone: (703) 614-4043 BlackBerry: (b)(6) DSN: (312) 224-4043 Fax: (703) 693-2907

www.facebook.com/ChiefofNavyChaplains www.chaplaincare.navy.mil

"Strengthen the Force +++ Engage with Leadership +++ Build the Community"

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic transmission may contain attorney work-product or information protected under the attorney-client privilege, both of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail, please delete it after notifying the sender of erroneous transmission. Do not release outside of DoD channels without prior authorization from the sender.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

(b)(6)

CIV RLISO, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 11:58
To: (b)(6) CIV NDW HQ, N3
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: NATIONAL MEMORIAL SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN
Signed By: (b)(6)

Can you forward the attachment pls

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 11:42 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: NATIONAL MEMORIAL SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

(b)(6), Good work.

Would like to add the following pieces to our plan.

1. I think (b)(6) call sign is too long. Needs to be shorter, something like X-Ray-One.
2. ALL personnel with radios must have a call sign.
 - A. ALL on the Yard with a radio might be Yankee-One thru Yankee-Five-Zero (just an example).
 - B. ALL at MBW might be Mike-One thru Mike-(whatever).
 - C. Command Post in ROC will be CHARLIE PAPA
3. ALL with radios and in the CP need a map of the WNY and a map of area around MBW with them so they can provide their location in a clear manner ("southeast corner of building 196", or "outside Gate 9" for example).
4. I think (b)(6) is the On Scene Commander (OSC), but (b)(6) is the Officer in Tactical Command (OTC), and the CoS at the event CP in the ROC will be the acting OTC when (b)(6) is not in the ROC. Will discuss role of OTC and OSC with (b)(6) later today.
5. Additional contingency call signs (I do not think these will be needed but must be in place in the event something happens and we need to come up on the net to talk to each other.):
 - (b)(6) call sign will be ALFA ONE.
 - (b)(6) call sign will be ALFA TWO.
 - (b)(6) will be BRAVO ONE.
 - If additional NDW person-specific call signs are needed they will continue the ALFA series, same for NSAW continuing the BRAVO series.
 - If DDNS takes me up on the offer of a radio so he and (b)(6) are in continuous comms his call sign will be DELTA ONE.

W/r, CoS

(b)(6) USN
COS/Deputy Commandant
Naval District Washington
O - (202) 433-3737
M - (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW HQ, N3
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 17:54
To: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N3 OPERATIONS
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: NATIONAL MEMORIAL SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

(b)(6)

Attached comm plan has been approved by (b)(6). I will distribute radios Sunday morning.

For personnel assigned to ushers and transportation I will conduct OJT when radios are picked up.

V/R
(b)(6)

(b)(6)
NDW HQ N3 Technology
Naval District Washington
Washington, DC 20374-5001
(b)(6)
(O) 202.433.0180
(C) (b)(6)

How is NDW doing? Please let us know by using our ICE survey.
https://ice.disa.mil/index.cfm?fa=site&site_id=811

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 11:42
To: (b)(6)

Cc:

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: NATIONAL MEMORIAL SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

This message has been archived.

(b)(6), Good work.

Would like to add the following pieces to our plan.

1. I think (b)(6) call sign is too long. Needs to be shorter, something like X-Ray-One.
2. ALL personnel with radios must have a call sign.
 - A. ALL on the Yard with a radio might be Yankee-One thru Yankee-Five-Zero (just an example).
 - B. ALL at MBW might be Mike-One thru Mike-(whatever).
 - C. Command Post in ROC will be CHARLIE PAPA
3. ALL with radios and in the CP need a map of the WNY and a map

(b)(6)

CIV RLSD, NDW

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW HQ, N3
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 12:03
To: (b)(6)

Cc: (b)(6)

Subject: RE: NATIONAL MEMORIAL SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

This message has been archived.

CoS,

Thank you and copy all. I am working with NDW N3AT to identify posts/personnel to issue radios to along with callsigns. Will adjust fire as directed below and provide updated Commplan and post/callsign list to all soonest.

V/R

(b)(6)

(b)(6)
NDW HQ N3 Technology
Naval District Washington
Washington, DC 20374-5001

(b)(6)
(O) 202.433.0180
(C) (b)(6)

How is NDW doing? Please let us know by using our ICE survey.
<https://ice.disa.mil/index.c>

(b)(6)

CIV RLISO, NDW

From: (b)(6) USARMY MDW (US) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2013 16:34
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Subject: RE: NDW N3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Signed By: (b)(6)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Thanks (b)(6)...Already discussed with our J3--he is on it, and we'll work to provide additional military or civilian law enforcement or security support--whatever you need.

V/R,

(b)(6)

CG, MDW/JFHQ-NCR

(202) 685-2807

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00 [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2013 4:18 PM
To: (b)(6) USARMY MDW (US)
Subject: NDW N3

(b)(6)

As discussed, attached is contact info for my N3. Not sure what we'll work out but your support is certainly greatly appreciated.

v/r

(b)(6)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From:

(b)(6)

CHINFO

Sent:

Thursday, September 26, 2013 19:20

To:

(b)(6)

Cc:

(b)(6)

Subject:

Re: NEWS: AP - Navy Yard Employees Get Counseling After Massacre

Excellent piece (b)(6). Excellent.

Thanks,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6)

CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 07:10 PM

To: (b)(6)

CNIC HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: NEWS: AP - Navy Yard Employees Get Counseling After Massacre

(b)(6) AP print story as a result of today's media engagement.

Vr,

(b)(6)

http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory/navy-yard-employees-counseling-massacre-20389266?singlePage=true

Navy Yard Employees Get Counseling After Massacre WASHINGTON September 27, 2013 (AP)

By ERIC TUCKER Associated Press

(b)(6) is accustomed to responding to a hazardous materials spill or ferocious natural disaster from his post at the Washington Navy Yard's emergency operations center.

A panicked call of shots fired that reached his radio on the morning of Sept. 16 presented a chilling new challenge.

"It was terrifying," (b)(6) a (b)(6) Navy electronics technician who runs the center, recalled in an interview Thursday about the shooting of 12 people inside Building 197.

Ten days later, (b)(6) remains haunted by that morning.

When a base-wide announcement system was tested in the days after the shooting - the same system he had used to declare the base on lockdown - he said he "got a little freaked out." When he leaves work at the end of his shift, or when he goes to pick up his children, he panics that a similar disaster will strike the base and he won't be there - or maybe no one will - to respond.

"I worry about not being there to receive the call when it happens, he said.

(b)(6) has received both group and one-on-one counseling since the shooting, and he's hardly alone. Navy officials say counselors have so far interacted with more than 6,000 employees at the Navy Yard, many of whom were inside Building 197 when former Navy reservist (b)(6) - who worked there as an IT contractor - opened fire with a shotgun. He was killed by a police officer more than an hour after the shooting began.

A specialized team that responds to industrial accidents, death on bases and other traumatic events deployed from Virginia to Washington, with counselors checking in with workers at the water cooler or on smoke break. Some employees have attended large group counseling sessions or scheduled one-on-one appointments.

"We're hearing the wide range of normal. People are scared, they're angry, they're sad. Some have lost co-workers. Everyone on the base has been impacted one way or another," said Navy (b)(6) a leader of the Special Psychiatric Rapid Intervention Team, or SPRINT, in Portsmouth, Va., adding, "We try to get out and touch as many people as we can."

The counselors stress to workers that they're experiencing normal reactions to an abnormal event, a message Wood said he especially appreciates as he revisits memories of the "shocked" faces of the first responders and the laundry list of responsibilities he performed that day - from alerting his chain of command, processing messages from Building 197 and spreading word that the base was on lockdown.

"Every duty day, every shift I've ever been on, we've always prepared for events like this. And you train and you train and you train, and however much training you do, you always hope that nothing will ever happen. It happened, though, and thankfully I had that training to rely on."

The aid is a way to offer support to stressed-out workers but also to help the base regain a semblance of normalcy. Building 197 remains closed and is still considered a crime scene, its workers displaced.

And signs of the shooting, both subtle and overt, are present through the Navy Yard: bouquets of flowers left at the base of a public art sculpture near an entrance gate, a large police communications vehicle parked outside, Red Cross workers handing out food and therapy dogs strolling the grounds with their handlers.

(b)(6) was suffering from delusions in the month leading up to the shooting, leaving a note that he was driven to kill because of bombardment by extremely low frequency radio waves, the FBI said. The FBI also released surveillance footage Wednesday showing (b)(6) hunting victims with a shotgun, a decision that angered defense officials who worried that the disturbing video would re-ignite panic and stress for workers at the Navy Yard. The FBI defended that decision Thursday, citing the tremendous public interest in the shooting.

Meanwhile, the Navy on Thursday ordered an in-depth investigation into the shooting and the events that led up to it, including a detailed look at the shooter, his mental health background and whether any adverse information was ever reported to the service about him.

The SPRINT team expects to be on the base through the end of next week as demand for services - which was high early this week - starts to wane. Most won't require long-term mental health care.

"What we hope and what we expect is that most people will return to normal," (b)(6) said.

(b)(6)

CIV RLISO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 20:13
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc:

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: NEWS: AP - Navy Yard Employees Get Counseling After Massacre
Signed By: (b)(6)

(b)(6) ,

Here's a link to the AP-TV news piece (on the USA Today website) focused on the SPRINT team. Another homerun!

<http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/video/grief-counselors-dogs-help-navy-yard-survivors/2698296588001>

Vr,

(b)(6)

(b)(6) USN
Director of Public Affairs
Commander, Navy Installations Command
W: 202.685.0867
C: (b)(6)
<http://www.cnic.navy.mil>
<http://facebook.com/navyinstallations>
<http://twitter.com/cnichq>

"Fleet, Fighter, Family"

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 19:10

To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: NEWS: AP - Navy Yard Employees Get Counseling After Massacre

(b)(6) AP print story as a result of today's media engagement.

Vr,

(b)(6)

<http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory/navy-yard-employees-counseling-massacre-20389266?singlePage=true>

Navy Yard Employees Get Counseling After Massacre
WASHINGTON September 27, 2013 (AP)

By ERIC TUCKER Associated Press

(b)(6) is accustomed to responding to a hazardous materials spill or ferocious natural disaster from his post at the Washington Navy Yard's emergency operations center.

A panicked call of shots fired that reached his radio on the morning of Sept. 16 presented a chilling new challenge.

"It was terrifying," (b)(6) a (b)(6) Navy electronics technician who runs the center, recalled in an interview Thursday about the shooting of 12 people inside Building 197.

Ten days later, (b)(6) remains haunted by that morning.

When a base-wide announcement system was tested in the days after the shooting - the same system he had used to declare the base on lockdown - he said he "got a little freaked out." When he leaves work at the end of his shift, or when he goes to pick up his children, he panics that a similar disaster will strike the base and he won't be there - or maybe no one will - to respond.

"I worry about not being there to receive the call when it happens, he said.

(b)(6) has received both group and one-on-one counseling since the shooting, and he's hardly alone. Navy officials say counselors have so far interacted with more than 6,000 employees at the Navy Yard, many of whom were inside Building 197 when former Navy reservist (b)(6) - who worked there as an IT contractor - opened fire with a shotgun. He was killed by a police officer more than an hour after the shooting began.

A specialized team that responds to industrial accidents, death on bases and other traumatic events deployed from Virginia to Washington, with counselors checking in with workers at the water cooler or on smoke break. Some employees have attended large group counseling sessions or scheduled one-on-one appointments.

"We're hearing the wide range of normal. People are scared, they're angry, they're sad. Some have lost co-workers. Everyone on the base has been impacted one way or another," said Navy (b)(6), a leader of the Special Psychiatric Rapid Intervention Team, or SPRINT, in Portsmouth, Va., adding, "We try to get out and touch as many people as we can."

The counselors stress to workers that they're experiencing normal reactions to an abnormal event, a message Wood said he especially appreciates as he revisits memories of the "shocked" faces of the first responders and the laundry list of responsibilities he performed that day - from alerting his chain of command, processing messages from Building 197 and spreading word that the base was on lockdown.

"Every duty day, every shift I've ever been on, we've always prepared for events like this. And you train and you train and you train, and however much training you do, you always hope that nothing will ever happen. It happened, though, and thankfully I had that training to rely on."

The aid is a way to offer support to stressed-out workers but also to help the base regain a semblance of normalcy. Building 197 remains closed and is still considered a crime scene, its workers displaced.

And signs of the shooting, both subtle and overt, are present through the Navy Yard: bouquets of flowers left at the base of a public art sculpture near an entrance gate, a large police communications vehicle parked outside, Red Cross workers handing out food and therapy dogs strolling the grounds with their handlers.

(b)(6) was suffering from delusions in the month leading up to the shooting, leaving a note that he was driven to kill because of bombardment by extremely low frequency radio waves, the FBI said. The FBI also released surveillance footage Wednesday showing (b)(6) hunting victims with a shotgun, a decision that angered defense officials who worried that the disturbing video would re-ignite panic and stress for workers at the Navy Yard. The FBI defended that decision Thursday, citing the tremendous public interest in the shooting.

Meanwhile, the Navy on Thursday ordered an in-depth investigation into the shooting and the events that led up to it, including a detailed look at the shooter, his mental health background and whether any adverse information was ever reported to the service about him.

The SPRINT team expects to be on the base through the end of next week as demand for services - which was high early this week - starts to wane. Most won't require long-term mental health care.

"What we hope and what we expect is that most people will return to normal," (b)(6) said.

(b)(6)

CIV RLSD, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 17:14
To: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: PAO Cell update

(b)(6)

Thank you. A Task Force headed by (b)(6) is standing up to get our arms around all aspects of the events at WNY and recovery/follow-up actions. I expect more guidance direction on the PA side as a result. PA may even be a Task Group under the TF. More to follow tomorrow.

Wr, CoS

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 03:21 PM
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6) CIV NDW HQ, N00P
Subject: PAO Cell update

COS, Just wanted to give you an update.

The PAO cell is up and running with NDW, CNIC, and CHINFO reps, others virtually. Today we were primarily focused on accomplishing some media availabilities on EFAC ops. We had an AP reporter who spoke with the EFAC personnel and some that used the service. We posted the comfort dogs on our Facebook page and NBC4 picked up the image and posted on their site with a brief story. FOX5 then saw the NBC post and asked to come out and do a story which will air tonight at 1800.

The bad news I mentioned this morning is that there are 3 DOD review panels established to look at base security and we are again being restricted on what we can say until the reviews are complete.

We (the PAO cell) propose "first-hand" accounts of NDW first responders (leading with the NSAW police officers) who were on scene at Bldg 197 within minutes. We feel that this is a great good news story to tell that would help get OUR side of the story out without coming across as reacting to accusations.

Our intent would be to push content via Navy.mil and provide broadcast quality video interviews via DVIDS, which could be marketed to local affiliates across the nation, especially for hometowners.

CNIC PA is engaging CHINFO to get concurrence.

Dogs Give 'Hope' to Navy Yard Employees | NBC4 Washington <http://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/Dogs-Give-Hope-to-Navy-Yard-Employees-225323002.html>

v/r

(b)(6)

Director, Public Affairs
Naval District Washington
DSN: 288-2678

Comm: (202)433-2678

Fax: (202)433-3745

Mobile: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

"Like Us" on Facebook and follow us on Twitter to get up-to-date information on NDW!

<http://www.facebook.com/NavDistWash>

<http://twitter.com/NavalDistWash>

(b)(6)

CIV RLISO, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 12:16
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: Potential Meeting Tomorrow (24 Sep) Afternoon Re: Lessons Learned and Way Ahead

(b)(6), thank you. V/r, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 11:38 AM
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, COS
Subject: RE: Potential Meeting Tomorrow (24 Sep) Afternoon Re: Lessons Learned and Way Ahead

COS,
Thanks. We are tracking. CNIC N00 and N9 are planning on going.
V/R

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 11:30 AM
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: FW: Potential Meeting Tomorrow (24 Sep) Afternoon Re: Lessons Learned and Way Ahead

(b)(6) - FYSA.

(b)(6) - Plan now for transportation, etc.

W/r, CoS

(b)(6) USN
COS/Deputy Commandant
Naval District Washington
O - (202) 433-3737
M - (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS DEA
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 10:55

To: (b)(6)

NDW HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

OPNAV, DNS EA

Subject: FYI: Potential Meeting Tomorrow (24 Sep) Afternoon Re: Lessons Learned and Way Ahead

Sir, I wanted to make you aware of a potential meeting tentatively scheduled tomorrow afternoon between senior leaders from the Army who played a role in post Ft. Hood recovery. They have offered to share lessons learned and potential way ahead/recovery ideas.

The plan is for VCNO to host in the CNO's conference room tomorrow afternoon from 1600-1645.

NAVSEA, NAVFAC, CNIC, and NDW were the commands that were suggested to be invited.

This is still pretty fluid as we are trying to align multiple senior schedules and at this point we just wanted to share as a "save the date" type email. Formal invites via Outlook calendar will be forthcoming.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let (b)(6) (DNS EA CC'ed above) or myself know.

Thank you.

V/r,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Deputy Executive Assistant to Director, Navy Staff Pentagon 4E562

COM: (703) 697-7176

SIPR: (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6)

OPNAV, N09 VCNO

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 6:23 PM

To: (b)(6)

JSARMY HQDA VCSA (US)

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: Standing By to Assist (UNCLASSIFIED)

(b)(6)

We're still putting some of the "who" into our follow-on actions, but I am certain that Navy will want to take advantage of Army's generous offer of assistance. We'll be in touch. Have a great weekend.

V/r

(b)(6)

(b)(6) USN

Executive Assistant to

Vice-Chief of Naval Operations

Wk: (703)-697-8347

BB: (b)(6)

SIPR: (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA VCSA (US) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 6:04 PM
To: (b)(6) OPNAV, N09 VCNO
Cc: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA SECARMY (US)
Subject: Standing By to Assist (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: FOUO

(b)(6),

Wanted to link you up with (b)(6) - (b)(6) is the Director of the Army Staff's (b)(6) XO - he is standing by to help structure a meeting with your senior leadership and the Army leaders that helped our service through the Fort Hood shooting incident (b)(6), (b)(6), and (b)(6) (b)(6). Initial discussions had focused on a 24 SEP meeting, again (b)(6) is standing by to facilitate if this is desired by Navy senior leaders.

v/r

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Executive Officer to the Vice Chief Staff, Army
200 Army Pentagon, RM 3E672
Washington, DC 20310-0200
Comm: 703-695-4371
DSN: 225-4371
BB: (b)(6)

Follow the VCSA on Facebook: [www.facebook.com/\(b\)\(6\)](http://www.facebook.com/(b)(6))

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 9:55 AM
To: (b)(6) JSN (US)
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: FW: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

(b)(6), Know you all are very busy...just wanted to follow up on our offer. (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) will be in the DC area on 24 Sep and will be available in the am to discuss their experiences with your senior leadership. If your leaders still desire this engagement, would like to begin to work the DTG.
Thoughts?

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2013 7:47 AM
To: '(b)(6) OPNAV, DNS'
Subject: RE: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

(b)(6) Last night our Chief asked (b)(6) , (b)(6) , if he would setup a session with your CNO or VCNO to discuss his experiences at Ft Hood. He was the III Corps Commander during the incident. He would bring with him 2-3 other former Ft Hood senior staff members to enhance the dialogue. Focus would be long term recovery.

Please let me know, if your leadership would be interested?

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 6:46 PM
To: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
Subject: RE: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Thanks again (b)(6) Very helpful. I just finished reviewing the package you sent up and it is really insightful. Appreciate it greatly. VR, (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
[mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 14:40
To: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS
Subject: RE: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

(b)(6) Yes....we have established POCs and are sharing info....as you shift into the recovery phase, (b)(6) may want to have a VTC or face to face with a few of our folks.

Always good to support a friend!
(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 2:30 PM
To: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
Subject: RE: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

(b)(6) I spoke to (b)(6) . He says you guys hooked up. Are you comfortable from your end? I really appreciate your outreach and support.

VR, (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
[mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 20:47
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

(b)(6) will give you a call in the am to discuss support. I have CF two of our leaders who can assist.
Know you have your hands full....we can begin to put together the right team and be ready to assist when you need us. Standing by.
(b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 11:38 PM Coordinated Universal Time
To: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

(b)(6) i, Thanks. Very helpful
(b)(6) you can coordinate directly or I will setup a meeting with your POC's. This will prove very useful

Thanks. VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
[mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 07:28 PM
To: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS
Subject: RE: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

(b)(6) FYSA, Our Chief just spoke to the CNO and offered assistance from our former Ft Hood leaders. CNO accepted the support. I have sent a note to (b)(6) to determine his availability since he is out of country. Will begin to sort through who else we can bring together to assist with LLs.

If you agree, we can discuss, how we could assist tomorrow. Maybe a small team with lessons learned.

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 6:06 PM
To: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Thanks much (b)(6). VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) USARMY HQDA DAS (US)
[mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 06:05 PM
To: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: FW: NAVAL YARD SHOOTINGS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: FOUO

(b)(6), FYSA, wanted to offer (b)(6) assistance, he was the CofS at Ft Hood during the (b)(6) shooting to share lessons learned.

(b)(6)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: FOUO

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) JB Anacostia/Bolling HQ, JB00
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 12:00
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: Press conference concerns

Belay my last Sir,

It appears (b)(6) is pushing to after 1300 and I think we will be fine...

Sorry for the panic,

Very Respectfully,

(b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) JB Anacostia/Bolling HQ, JB00
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 11:52 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Press conference concerns

Sir,

(b)(6) is here with me at the EFAC. The family meeting at the club has been smooth out front but a challenge behind the scenes. The crowd is very emotional as you can understand. The families will be informed of the EFAC and given directions right after their meeting. I fear they may arrive during the press conference (b)(6) has scheduled for 1245. We recommend pushing that back 90 min to avoid a potential interaction between press and victim families. The press will behave themselves, but their mere presents may be troubling.
(b)(6) is reaching out to CNIC to see if a delay is reasonable.

VR,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 9:23
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RSVP Update

Great (b)(6). My only concern is that we may have folks that stayed away because they felt limited and then we have openings in end game. Hard to be perfect in this very short timeframe.

My report from 8th and I this morning was positive with no issues. VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) Naval Sea Systems Command, SEA 00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 09:18 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
<(b)(6)>; (b)(6) Vice Commander
Subject: Re: RSVP Update

Let us work it. (b)(6), can you forward this to (b)(6)
V/r.(b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) OPNAV, DNS
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 09:09 AM
To: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RSVP Update

(b)(6), Thanks.

Team, Is there a way to get the word out to others that were affected on the Yard or by association to offer seats to them? Some may have felt limited when we were working to manage the numbers earlier. (b)(6), any thoughts? VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:50 AM
To: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RSVP Update

Admirals,
Latest numbers as of 0700 this morning:
Maximum Allocation: 3,500
Current Total Attendees: 2,243

Latest VIP lists from WH, SecNav, and CNO is 265 total

Breakdown of our 3500 apportionment below:

NAVSEA Personnel Attending: 978 Number of NAVSEA Guests: 685 Total NAVSEA Attendees: 1,663 Percent of Overall Attendees: 74.1%

"Others" Attending: 384 Number of "Other" Guests: 196 Total "Other" Attendees: 580 Percent of Overall Attendees: 25.9%

We'll continue to monitor through the morning. I anticipate being able to support robust numbers of walk-ups if there is demand.

V/R

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N01
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 13:51
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral, we are working a better list of questions. COS is on his way to backfill you. VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:59 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks, still have a lot of blank responses...

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N01
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:56 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

I've got (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) working on answers to a couple of additional questions which I would like to see added. I'll come by the ROC and explain...VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:51 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral - Draft RTQ just in from (b)(6). Will review with N3.

Below is the cut & paste if you are limited to BB.

V/r, CoS

SECURITY

Q1. What time were your Navy Police officers dispatched to the shooting?

Answer: Officers were dispatched immediately upon the call for assistance coming in from building 197.

Q2: Were there enough police officers on duty on the Washington Navy Yard Monday? Is staffing sufficient to protect a base this size? How many officers were working that morning?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the

incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner. Additional support was available and called upon from security force personnel who were on the installation and not actively performing patrols or security functions. These officers if not already armed, were issued weapons and were able to respond within minutes of the initial response forces arriving at the scene.

Q3: Did the recent budget cuts at Naval District Washington affect the number of police force on the Washington Navy Yard? Has the number of officers been reduced over the past three years, and if so, by how much?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner.
(still need second part of answer)

Q4: Are police officers allowed to take their weapons home?

Answer: No, service weapons remain in the custody of the Washington Navy Yard.

Q5: Were the Naval District Washington officers the first to respond to this attack?

Answer: The first officers on scene were uniformed Navy Police Officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard. The initial response arrived within 3 minutes of the call for assistance and the backup patrol arrived one minute later. They teamed up in the building and began pursuit of the shooter.

Q6: Who specifically was the first to respond? I read a report one of your Chief's was on patrol and was among the first on the scene, is this accurate?

Answer: For security and privacy concerns, we will not release the name of the responding officers. The responding officers were supervisory officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard.

Q7: Do you know how many security contractors work inside and how many specifically were working that morning?

Answer: Again, it is Navy policy to not release information pertaining to security force composition related to specific operations. Contract security guards are utilized by tenant activities located on the Navy Yard to provide additional at their individual facilities based on their own unique requirements.

Q8: Is NCIS looking into whether the shooting was the result of a workplace disagreement?

Answer: Defer to NCIS for a response.

Q9: Did (b)(6) do business on the 4th floor of NAVSEA?

Answer:

Q10: Did anyone at The Experts alert USN that (b)(6) was unstable, or had been acting unusually?

Answer:

Q11: Is the Washington Navy Yard a "gun-free zone"?

Q12: Who is allowed to carry guns at Navy Yard? How many personnel are allowed to carry guns?

Q13: Why was the security at the Navy Yard gates after the event on Monday no different than Monday morning or any other morning? We had no random vehicle checks, bomb sniffing dogs, or pedestrian checks. The guards were not more heavily armed. All of this happened after 9/11. Badges were not scanned and I even had co-workers tell me they returned from lunch without all IDs being checked. This is shocking on the first day back from the tragic events of

Monday. My employees and our families are very concerned for our safety. How do we reassure them when nothing changes on day one?

Answer:

RADIO

Q14: Is it true that the radios were not working on the day of the Washington Navy Yard shooting?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident.

Q15: Could more lives have been saved if the radios were working properly?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident. No fire personnel were allowed in and or around building 197 because it was an active shooter scene. Additionally they are restricted to go near the scene until advised by law enforcement that it is safe to enter. The victims that were treated by fire personnel were away from building 197 in what the law enforcement determines a safe zone.

Q16: Was a runner required to relay messages of the incident because the radios were poorly working?

Answer: A runner was not required during the incident because there were no radio issues reported according to fire chief on duty.

Q17: Are there dead spots on the Washington Navy Yard that the radios don't function properly?

Answer: There are older buildings on the Washington Navy Yard that have thicker walls that interfere with radio communication. However, this was not the case with building 197 since it's one of the newer buildings on the Washington Navy Yard.

Q18: There were documents reporting the radio failures from 2010, 2012, and one report from Jan 2013. Is there a truth to this?

Answer: As with any IT system, NDW receives periodic complaints concerning coverage, connectivity, radios and repeaters. The region implemented a help desk process to ensure that calls were received, responded to and tracked using a help desk managed by Commander Navy Installations Command. First responders who experience issues with radio performance are instructed to identify that problem by calling the helpdesk to ensure resolution.

Q19: What is the Navy doing to address these radio failure reports?

Answer: NDW has excellent outside building coverage in the NCR, but the deployed system does not provide full in building coverage. After system deployment, the fire department performed extensive coverage tests in the buildings at all bases. Many NDW buildings have thick steel and concrete walls, and some buildings are specifically design to prevent RF penetration. To address this issue, NDW purchased portable repeater systems in 2011 for each fire department command unit to deploy in the event there was an emergency event in a non-covered building. NDW is not aware of any system that provides foolproof coverage in the types of buildings that exist in our region. Commander Naval Installations Command (CNIC) has ordered a full review of the radio system complaints and allegations and NDW will comply.

Answer:

Q20: Can we obtain a copy of the dispatch recording? Specifically a computerized record of the 911 calls and police radio traffic.

Answer:

Q21. Do contractors participate in Exercise Citadel Shield-Solid Curtain?

Answer: When we have exercises they do participate, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections. We have them at two installations, but not WNY.

Q22. When Metropolitan Police Department officers arrived at the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard Monday morning were the gates locked, causing delays? Why?

Answer:

Q23. Were HBC security contractors part of Citadel Shield or Solid Curtain? Navy staff and security are telling me "no".. contractors are NOT all part of the training?

Answer: We have HBC contracted access control guards at our Chesapeake Beach facility and at the Carderock facility. They do participate in exercises, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections.

Q24. How security force personnel are being RIF'd?

Q25. When will they be told?

Q26. How much money does the RIF save?

Q27. Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday?

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:38 PM

To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security

COS, attached is the DRAFT Q&A we have been working. This is meant to be comprehensive and cover all security issues.

v/r

(b)(6)

Director, Public Affairs

Naval District Washington

DSN: 288-2678

Comm: (202)433-2678

Fax: (202)433-3745

Mobile: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

"Like Us" on Facebook and follow us on Twitter to get up-to-date information on NDW!

<http://www.facebook.com/NavDistWash>

<http://twitter.com/NavalDistWash>

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:45 AM
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

I'm working with your PAO, (b)(6), to get a comprehensive list of RTQs that address all of the issues.

My intent, once developed and approved by CNIC, is to push up to CHINFO and ensure comms are in sync with the SECNAV-directed security review. I expect CHINFO to pushout info to national media, while NDW handles local media.

Vr,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:16 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,
BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,
(b)(6)

(b)(6) USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,
(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----
From (b)(6)
Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM

Subject: RTQ on Base Security

To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6),

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSD, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 13:02
To: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security

Yes sir. And the list (b)(6) forwarded is much more extensive than (b)(6) list in his email to (b)(6) this morning. Will sort out what really needs to be answered today and what can be delayed to Monday or later.

(b)(6) and I will talk shortly, and come up with today's way ahead.

V/r, CoS

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 1:00 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks, still have a lot of blank responses...

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N01
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:56 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

I've got (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) working on answers to a couple of additional questions which I would like to see added. I'll come by the ROC and explain...VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:51 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral - Draft RTQ just in from (b)(6). Will review with N3.

Below is the cut & paste if you are limited to BB.

V/r, CoS

SECURITY

Q1. What time were your Navy Police officers dispatched to the shooting?

Answer: Officers were dispatched immediately upon the call for assistance coming in from building 197.

Q2: Were there enough police officers on duty on the Washington Navy Yard Monday? Is staffing sufficient to protect a base this size? How many officers were working that morning?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner. Additional support was available and called upon from security force personnel who were on the installation and not actively performing patrols or security functions. These officers if not already armed, were issued weapons and were able to respond within minutes of the initial response forces arriving at the scene.

Q3: Did the recent budget cuts at Naval District Washington affect the number of police force on the Washington Navy Yard? Has the number of officers been reduced over the past three years, and if so, by how much?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner.
(still need second part of answer)

Q4: Are police officers allowed to take their weapons home?

Answer: No, service weapons remain in the custody of the Washington Navy Yard.

Q5: Were the Naval District Washington officers the first to respond to this attack?

Answer: The first officers on scene were uniformed Navy Police Officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard. The initial response arrived within 3 minutes of the call for assistance and the backup patrol arrived one minute later. They teamed up in the building and began pursuit of the shooter.

Q6: Who specifically was the first to respond? I read a report one of your Chief's was on patrol and was among the first on the scene, is this accurate?

Answer: For security and privacy concerns, we will not release the name of the responding officers. The responding officers were supervisory officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard.

Q7: Do you know how many security contractors work inside and how many specifically were working that morning?

Answer: Again, it is Navy policy to not release information pertaining to security force composition related to specific operations. Contract security guards are utilized by tenant activities located on the Navy Yard to provide additional at their individual facilities based on their own unique requirements.

Q8: Is NCIS looking into whether the shooting was the result of a workplace disagreement?

Answer: Defer to NCIS for a response.

Q9: Did (b)(6) do business on the 4th floor of NAVSEA?

Answer:

Q10: Did anyone at The Experts alert USN that (b)(6) was unstable, or had been acting unusually?

Answer:

Q11: Is the Washington Navy Yard a "gun-free zone"?

Q12: Who is allowed to carry guns at Navy Yard? How many personnel are allowed to carry guns?

Q13: Why was the security at the Navy Yard gates after the event on Monday no different than Monday morning or any other morning? We had no random vehicle checks, bomb sniffing dogs, or pedestrian checks. The guards were not more heavily armed. All of this happened after 9/11. Badges were not scanned and I even had co-workers tell me they returned from lunch without all IDs being checked. This is shocking on the first day back from the tragic events of Monday. My employees and our families are very concerned for our safety. How do we reassure them when nothing changes on day one?

Answer:

RADIO

Q14: Is it true that the radios were not working on the day of the Washington Navy Yard shooting?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident.

Q15: Could more lives have been saved if the radios were working properly?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident. No fire personnel were allowed in and or around building 197 because it was an active shooter scene. Additionally they are restricted to go near the scene until advised by law enforcement that it is safe to enter. The victims that were treated by fire personnel were away from building 197 in what the law enforcement determines a safe zone.

Q16: Was a runner required to relay messages of the incident because the radios were poorly working?

Answer: A runner was not required during the incident because there were no radio issues reported according to fire chief on duty.

Q17: Are there dead spots on the Washington Navy Yard that the radios don't function properly?

Answer: There are older buildings on the Washington Navy Yard that have thicker walls that interfere with radio communication. However, this was not the case with building 197 since it's one of the newer buildings on the Washington Navy Yard.

Q18: There were documents reporting the radio failures from 2010, 2012, and one report from Jan 2013. Is there a truth to this?

Answer: As with any IT system, NDW receives periodic complaints concerning coverage, connectivity, radios and repeaters. The region implemented a help desk process to ensure that calls were received, responded to and tracked using a help desk managed by Commander Navy Installations Command. First responders who experience issues with radio performance are instructed to identify that problem by calling the helpdesk to ensure resolution.

Q19: What is the Navy doing to address these radio failure reports?

Answer: NDW has excellent outside building coverage in the NCR, but the deployed system does not provide full in building coverage. After system deployment, the fire department performed extensive coverage tests in the buildings at all bases. Many NDW buildings have thick steel and concrete walls, and some buildings are specifically design to prevent RF penetration. To address this issue, NDW purchased portable repeater systems in 2011 for each fire department command unit to deploy in the event there was an emergency event in an non-covered building. NDW is not aware of any system that provides foolproof coverage in the types of buildings that exist in our region. Commander Naval Installations Command (CNIC) has ordered a full review of the radio system complaints and allegations and NDW will comply.

Answer:

Q20: Can we obtain a copy of the dispatch recording? Specifically a computerized record of the 911 calls and police radio traffic.

Answer:

Q21. Do contractors participate in Exercise Citadel Shield-Solid Curtain?

Answer: When we have exercises they do participate, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections. We have them at two installations, but not WNY.

Q22. When Metropolitan Police Department officers arrived at the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard Monday morning were the gates locked, causing delays? Why?

Answer:

Q23. Were HBC security contractors part of Citadel Shield or Solid Curtain? Navy staff and security are telling me "no".. contractors are NOT all part of the training?

Answer: We have HBC contracted access control guards at our Chesapeake Beach facility and at the Carderock facility. They do participate in exercises, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections.

Q24. How security force personnel are being RIF'd?

Q25. When will they be told?

Q26. How much money does the RIF save?

Q27. Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday?

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:38 PM
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)
N3; (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security

COS, attached is the DRAFT Q&A we have been working. This is meant to be comprehensive and cover all security issues.

v/r

(b)(6)

Director, Public Affairs
Naval District Washington
DSN: 288-2678
Comm: (202)433-2678
Fax: (202)433-3745
Mobile: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

"Like Us" on Facebook and follow us on Twitter to get up-to-date information on NDW!

<http://www.facebook.com/NavDistWash>

<http://twitter.com/NavalDistWash>

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:45 AM
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

I'm working with your PAO, (b)(6), to get a comprehensive list of RTQs that address all of the issues.

My intent, once developed and approved by CNIC, is to push up to CHINFO and ensure comms are in sync with the SECNAV-directed security review. I expect CHINFO to pushout info to national media, while NDW handles local media.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) IL NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:16 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/ (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,
BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM

To: (b)(6)

CNIC HQ, NOOP

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

, USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6)

[mailto:(b)(6)]

Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM

To: (b)(6)

CHINFO

Cc: (b)(6)

chinfo.dutyoffic.oft <chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil>

Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>

Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM

Subject: RTQ on Base Security

To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6),

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 13:00
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks, still have a lot of blank responses...

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N01
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:56 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

I've got (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) working on answers to a couple of additional questions which I would like to see added. I'll come by the ROC and explain...VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:51 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral - Draft RTQ just in from (b)(6). Will review with N3.

Below is the cut & paste if you are limited to BB.

V/r, CoS

SECURITY

Q1. What time were your Navy Police officers dispatched to the shooting?

Answer: Officers were dispatched immediately upon the call for assistance coming in from building 197.

Q2: Were there enough police officers on duty on the Washington Navy Yard Monday? Is staffing sufficient to protect a base this size? How many officers were working that morning?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner. Additional support was available and called upon from security force personnel who were on the installation and not actively performing patrols or security functions. These officers if not already armed, were issued weapons and were able to respond within minutes of the initial response forces arriving at the scene.

Q3: Did the recent budget cuts at Naval District Washington affect the number of police force on the Washington Navy Yard? Has the number of officers been reduced over the past three years, and if so, by how much?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner.
(still need second part of answer)

Q4: Are police officers allowed to take their weapons home?

Answer: No, service weapons remain in the custody of the Washington Navy Yard.

Q5: Were the Naval District Washington officers the first to respond to this attack?

Answer: The first officers on scene were uniformed Navy Police Officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard. The initial response arrived within 3 minutes of the call for assistance and the backup patrol arrived one minute later. They teamed up in the building and began pursuit of the shooter.

Q6: Who specifically was the first to respond? I read a report one of your Chief's was on patrol and was among the first on the scene, is this accurate?

Answer: For security and privacy concerns, we will not release the name of the responding officers. The responding officers were supervisory officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard.

Q7: Do you know how many security contractors work inside and how many specifically were working that morning?

Answer: Again, it is Navy policy to not release information pertaining to security force composition related to specific operations. Contract security guards are utilized by tenant activities located on the Navy Yard to provide additional at their individual facilities based on their own unique requirements.

Q8: Is NCIS looking into whether the shooting was the result of a workplace disagreement?

Answer: Defer to NCIS for a response.

Q9: Did (b)(6) do business on the 4th floor of NAVSEA?

Answer:

Q10: Did anyone at The Experts alert USN that (b)(6) was unstable, or had been acting unusually?

Answer:

Q11: Is the Washington Navy Yard a "gun-free zone"?

Q12: Who is allowed to carry guns at Navy Yard? How many personnel are allowed to carry guns?

Q13: Why was the security at the Navy Yard gates after the event on Monday no different than Monday morning or any other morning? We had no random vehicle checks, bomb sniffing dogs, or pedestrian checks. The guards were not more heavily armed. All of this happened after 9/11. Badges were not scanned and I even had co-workers tell me they returned from lunch without all IDs being checked. This is shocking on the first day back from the tragic events of Monday. My employees and our families are very concerned for our safety. How do we reassure them when nothing changes on day one?

Answer:

RADIO

Q14: Is it true that the radios were not working on the day of the Washington Navy Yard shooting?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident.

Q15: Could more lives have been saved if the radios were working properly?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident. No fire personnel were allowed in and or around building 197 because it was an active shooter scene. Additionally they are restricted to go near the scene until advised by law enforcement that it is safe to enter. The victims that were treated by fire personnel were away from building 197 in what the law enforcement determines a safe zone.

Q16: Was a runner required to relay messages of the incident because the radios were poorly working?

Answer: A runner was not required during the incident because there were no radio issues reported according to fire chief on duty.

Q17: Are there dead spots on the Washington Navy Yard that the radios don't function properly?

Answer: There are older buildings on the Washington Navy Yard that have thicker walls that interfere with radio communication. However, this was not the case with building 197 since it's one of the newer buildings on the Washington Navy Yard.

Q18: There were documents reporting the radio failures from 2010, 2012, and one report from Jan 2013. Is there a truth to this?

Answer: As with any IT system, NDW receives periodic complaints concerning coverage, connectivity, radios and repeaters. The region implemented a help desk process to ensure that calls were received, responded to and tracked using a help desk managed by Commander Navy Installations Command. First responders who experience issues with radio performance are instructed to identify that problem by calling the helpdesk to ensure resolution.

Q19: What is the Navy doing to address these radio failure reports?

Answer: NDW has excellent outside building coverage in the NCR, but the deployed system does not provide full in building coverage. After system deployment, the fire department performed extensive coverage tests in the buildings at all bases. Many NDW buildings have thick steel and concrete walls, and some buildings are specifically design to prevent RF penetration. To address this issue, NDW purchased portable repeater systems in 2011 for each fire department command unit to deploy in the event there was an emergency event in an non-covered building. NDW is not aware of any system that provides foolproof coverage in the types of buildings that exist in our region. Commander Naval Installations Command (CNIC) has ordered a full review of the radio system complaints and allegations and NDW will comply.

Answer:

Q20: Can we obtain a copy of the dispatch recording? Specifically a computerized record of the 911 calls and police radio traffic.

Answer:

Q21. Do contractors participate in Exercise Citadel Shield-Solid Curtain?

Answer: When we have exercises they do participate, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections. We have them at two installations, but not WNY.

Q22. When Metropolitan Police Department officers arrived at the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard Monday morning were the gates locked, causing delays? Why?

Answer:

Q23. Were HBC security contractors part of Citadel Shield or Solid Curtain? Navy staff and security are telling me "no".. contractors are NOT all part of the training?

Answer: We have HBC contracted access control guards at our Chesapeake Beach facility and at the Carderock facility. They do participate in exercises, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections.

Q24. How security force personnel are being RIF'd?

Q25. When will they be told?

Q26. How much money does the RIF save?

Q27. Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday?

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:38 PM

To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security

COS, attached is the DRAFT Q&A we have been working. This is meant to be comprehensive and cover all security issues.

v/r

(b)(6)

Director, Public Affairs
Naval District Washington

DSN: 288-2678

Comm: (202)433-2678

Fax: (202)433-3745

Mobile: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

"Like Us" on Facebook and follow us on Twitter to get up-to-date information on NDW!

<http://www.facebook.com/NavDistWash>

<http://twitter.com/NavalDistWash>

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:45 AM

To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

I'm working with your PAO, (b)(6), to get a comprehensive list of RTQs that address all of the issues.

My intent, once developed and approved by CNIC, is to push up to CHINFO and ensure comms are in sync with the SECNAV-directed security review. I expect CHINFO to pushout info to national media, while NDW handles local media.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:16 AM

To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/ (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM

To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6) USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM

To: (b)(6) CHINFO

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM

To: (b)(6) CHINFO

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM

To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,

(b)(6)

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]

Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM

To: (b)(6) CHINFO

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>

Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM

Subject: RTQ on Base Security

To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6),

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different note, several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N01
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:57
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

I've got (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) working on answers to a couple of additional questions which I would like to see added. I'll come by the ROC and explain...VR, (b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:51 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral - Draft RTQ just in from (b)(6). Will review with N3.

Below is the cut & paste if you are limited to BB.

V/r, CoS

SECURITY

Q1. What time were your Navy Police officers dispatched to the shooting?

Answer: Officers were dispatched immediately upon the call for assistance coming in from building 197.

Q2: Were there enough police officers on duty on the Washington Navy Yard Monday? Is staffing sufficient to protect a base this size? How many officers were working that morning?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner. Additional support was available and called upon from security force personnel who were on the installation and not actively performing patrols or security functions. These officers if not already armed, were issued weapons and were able to respond within minutes of the initial response forces arriving at the scene.

Q3: Did the recent budget cuts at Naval District Washington affect the number of police force on the Washington Navy Yard? Has the number of officers been reduced over the past three years, and if so, by how much?

Answer: Navy policy prohibits the release of specific details regarding security force composition and staffing levels. With that said, there were adequate police officers on duty on the day of the incident to provide patrol response to the incident and to secure the perimeter of the installation in a timely manner.
(still need second part of answer)

Q4: Are police officers allowed to take their weapons home?

Answer: No, service weapons remain in the custody of the Washington Navy Yard.

Q5: Were the Naval District Washington officers the first to respond to this attack?

Answer: The first officers on scene were uniformed Navy Police Officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard. The initial response arrived within 3 minutes of the call for assistance and the backup patrol arrived one minute later. They teamed up in the building and began pursuit of the shooter.

Q6: Who specifically was the first to respond? I read a report one of your Chief's was on patrol and was among the first on the scene, is this accurate?

Answer: For security and privacy concerns, we will not release the name of the responding officers. The responding officers were supervisory officers assigned to the Washington Navy Yard.

Q7: Do you know how many security contractors work inside and how many specifically were working that morning?

Answer: Again, it is Navy policy to not release information pertaining to security force composition related to specific operations. Contract security guards are utilized by tenant activities located on the Navy Yard to provide additional at their individual facilities based on their own unique requirements.

Q8: Is NCIS looking into whether the shooting was the result of a workplace disagreement?

Answer: Defer to NCIS for a response.

Q9: Did (b)(6) do business on the 4th floor of NAVSEA?

Answer:

Q10: Did anyone at The Experts alert USN that (b)(6) was unstable, or had been acting unusually?

Answer:

Q11: Is the Washington Navy Yard a "gun-free zone"?

Q12: Who is allowed to carry guns at Navy Yard? How many personnel are allowed to carry guns?

Q13: Why was the security at the Navy Yard gates after the event on Monday no different than Monday morning or any other morning? We had no random vehicle checks, bomb sniffing dogs, or pedestrian checks. The guards were not more heavily armed. All of this happened after 9/11. Badges were not scanned and I even had co-workers tell me they returned from lunch without all IDs being checked. This is shocking on the first day back from the tragic events of Monday. My employees and our families are very concerned for our safety. How do we reassure them when nothing changes on day one?

Answer:

RADIO

Q14: Is it true that the radios were not working on the day of the Washington Navy Yard shooting?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident.

Q15: Could more lives have been saved if the radios were working properly?

Answer: The fire chief on duty at the time did not observe any radio errors or issues on the ELMR system reported for this incident. No fire personnel were allowed in and or around building 197 because it was an active shooter scene.

Additionally they are restricted to go near the scene until advised by law enforcement that it is safe to enter. The victims that were treated by fire personnel were away from building 197 in what the law enforcement determines a safe zone.

Q16: Was a runner required to relay messages of the incident because the radios were poorly working?

Answer: A runner was not required during the incident because there were no radio issues reported according to fire chief on duty.

Q17: Are there dead spots on the Washington Navy Yard that the radios don't function properly?

Answer: There are older buildings on the Washington Navy Yard that have thicker walls that interfere with radio communication. However, this was not the case with building 197 since it's one of the newer buildings on the Washington Navy Yard.

Q18: There were documents reporting the radio failures from 2010, 2012, and one report from Jan 2013. Is there a truth to this?

Answer: As with any IT system, NDW receives periodic complaints concerning coverage, connectivity, radios and repeaters. The region implemented a help desk process to ensure that calls were received, responded to and tracked using a help desk managed by Commander Navy Installations Command. First responders who experience issues with radio performance are instructed to identify that problem by calling the helpdesk to ensure resolution.

Q19: What is the Navy doing to address these radio failure reports?

Answer: NDW has excellent outside building coverage in the NCR, but the deployed system does not provide full in building coverage. After system deployment, the fire department performed extensive coverage tests in the buildings at all bases. Many NDW buildings have thick steel and concrete walls, and some buildings are specifically design to prevent RF penetration. To address this issue, NDW purchased portable repeater systems in 2011 for each fire department command unit to deploy in the event there was an emergency event in an non-covered building. NDW is not aware of any system that provides foolproof coverage in the types of buildings that exist in our region. Commander Naval Installations Command (CNIC) has ordered a full review of the radio system complaints and allegations and NDW will comply.

Answer:

Q20: Can we obtain a copy of the dispatch recording? Specifically a computerized record of the 911 calls and police radio traffic.

Answer:

Q21. Do contractors participate in Exercise Citadel Shield-Solid Curtain?

Answer: When we have exercises they do participate, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections. We have them at two installations, but not WNY.

Q22. When Metropolitan Police Department officers arrived at the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard Monday morning were the gates locked, causing delays? Why?

Answer:

Q23. Were HBC security contractors part of Citadel Shield or Solid Curtain? Navy staff and security are telling me "no".. contractors are NOT all part of the training?

Answer: We have HBC contracted access control guards at our Chesapeake Beach facility and at the Carderock facility. They do participate in exercises, but are limited to controlling access and vehicle inspections.

Q24. How security force personnel are being RIF'd?

Q25. When will they be told?

Q26. How much money does the RIF save?

Q27. Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday?

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:38 PM

To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security

COS, attached is the DRAFT Q&A we have been working. This is meant to be comprehensive and cover all security issues.

v/r

(b)(6)

Director, Public Affairs

Naval District Washington

DSN: 288-2678

Comm: (202)433-2678

Fax: (202)433-3745

Mobile: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

"Like Us" on Facebook and follow us on Twitter to get up-to-date information on NDW!

<http://www.facebook.com/NavDistWash>

<http://twitter.com/NavalDistWash>

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:45 AM

To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

I'm working with your PAO, (b)(6), to get a comprehensive list of RTQs that address all of the issues.

My intent, once developed and approved by CNIC, is to push up to CHINFO and ensure comms are in sync with the SECNAV-directed security review. I expect CHINFO to pushout info to national media, while NDW handles local media.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:16 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/ (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,
BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:
- that the radios didn't work,

- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,
Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6).

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,
(b)(6)

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
chinfo.dutyoffic.oft <chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil>
Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,
(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM
Subject: RTQ on Base Security
To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

(b)(6),

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,
(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:35
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security
Signed By: (b)(6)

Roger Sir.

v/r
(b)(6)
Director, Public Affairs
Naval District Washington
DSN: 288-2678
Comm: (202)433-2678
Fax: (202)433-3745
Mobile: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

"Like Us" on Facebook and follow us on Twitter to get up-to-date information on NDW!
<http://www.facebook.com/NavDistWash>
<http://twitter.com/NavalDistWash>

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:17 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/ (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,
BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM

To: (b)(6) CHINFO

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM

To: (b)(6) CHINFO

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,
(b)(6)

(b)(6), USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
chinfo.dutyoffic.oft <chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil>
Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,
(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM
Subject: RTQ on Base Security
To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

(b)(6) ,

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,
(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:45
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Cc:

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

I'm working with your PAO, (b)(6), to get a comprehensive list of RTQs that address all of the issues.

My intent, once developed and approved by CNIC, is to push up to CHINFO and ensure comms are in sync with the SECNAV-directed security review. I expect CHINFO to pushout info to national media, while NDW handles local media.

Vr,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:16 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,
(b)(6)

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
chinfo.dutyoffic.oft <chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil>
Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,
(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>

Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM

Subject: RTQ on Base Security

To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil

Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSO, NDW

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N3
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:44
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security
Signed By: (b)(6)

Sir,
ED, COS, (b)(6), CNIC (06) and I are locking all of the information into a path between commands to ensure that we have a single POC from each agency and way to keep track.

VR
(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:17 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,

(b)(6)

(b)(6) ; USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
chinfo.dutyoffic.oft <chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil>
Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM
Subject: RTQ on Base Security
To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

(b)(6),

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLSD, NDW

From: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N3
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:41
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security
Signed By: (b)(6)

Sir,

We are locked on with PAO and currently have CNIC (06) in front of me working the issue. Also the COS is here as we talk through the collection process.

VR

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:54 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV NDW WNYD, N3
Cc: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

Haven't we got ready responses to these issues? I think CNIC CoS will be touching base w/ you to help address the below issues. Including correcting the RIF issue.

R/

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:
- that the radios didn't work,

- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN
Chief of Information
(b)(6)
O: 703-697-7391
C: (b)(6)
H: (b)(6)
Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, NOOP
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)

A couple things ...

-- surprised this RTQ is so short. There are a lot of claims in that IG report that I suspect we could address: cost-cutting claims, cronyism in selecting EID, 52 felons admitted to bases. I think we need this fleshed out.

-- radio's. What is ground truth about communications gear that morning? The story still circulates that they were faulty and that law enforcement couldn't speak to one another. If it's false, we need to get that out there. If true, if there is any context we can provide, let's do that too.

-- under-staffing. Where are we on the numbers of guards on duty? I thought (b)(6) denied we had staffing probs, but I never really saw any pushback to that narrative. If it's wrong, we need to say so. The union guy is running the tables.

-- RIF. How many? When will they be told? How much money does it save? Were any of those being RIF'd on duty and in the fight on Monday? I'm not going to let a PR problem dictate policy, but the timing of this couldn't be worse. It will feed the narrative that we are under-cutting security to save a buck. If your boss intends to pursue, you need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in the context of Monday's shooting.

Thanks,
(b)(6)

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 05:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)
chinfo.dutyoffic.oft <chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil>
Subject: Fwd: RTQ on Base Security

CI, FYSA working RTQ below for your team and SECNAV's approval.

Vr,
(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Date: Sat, Sep 21, 2013 at 4:44 PM
Subject: RTQ on Base Security
To: chinfo.dutyoffic.oft@navy.mil
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

(b)(6).

For CHINFO's review. Also need SECNAV concurrence, since they have the lead for the IG report. Plan is to push to the Regions once approved.

On a different, note several base security guards are expected to get RIF notifications this week, as part of CNIC's FY13 RIF plan. We expect this to be the next big narrative to involve early next week.

Wr,
(b)(6)

(b)(6)

CIV RLISO, NDW

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:22
To: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Subject: RE: RTQ on Base Security

Boss,

(b)(6) is at MBW but will return to the Yard in a little while. He has a draft RTQ addressing these types of questions that I told him to send to you and me as soon as he returns.

Not sure what has been provided to CNIC and CHINFO up till now - will sort that out with (b)(6) upon his return. Also need to decide who will release the RTQs to the press.

V/r, CoS

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) NDW HQ, N00
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 11:17 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)
(b)(6)
Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

(b)(6)

I believe these issues have been looked into and addressed at the N3 level. I believe we have a reasonable response to each of them.

In my view the responses are not as much of a challenge as PA organization and communications, for some reason the RFIs we've been working through aren't getting translated into something CHINFO is happy with.

Doesn't CHINFO have PA lead? If so then let's get a PA process organized because my N3 team doesn't have the bandwidth to keep doing this (answering the same question repeatedly) and everything else that's going on.

R/(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 10:25 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Fw: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

BLUF: (b)(6) wants us (primarily NDW) to push-out facts to the media about the security issues regarding the WNY shooting. NCACS will be the next issue to address tomorrow. Need to coordinate with CHINFO to ensure it's in sync with the comms regarding the on-going SECNAV-directed security review.

Below is my email exchange with (b)(6) regarding the draft RTQ. Key points are:

--The IG report is not the story. Right now it's all NSAW base security issues, that NDW is currently drafting RTQs for that address facts regarding reports:

- that the radios didn't work,
- that we had too few guards on duty
- that a gate was locked shut
- that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

Next step would be the RTQs associated with:

-- NCACS IG RTQ should address: cost-cutting claims, selection of EID, 52 felons admitted to bases.

-- Address RIF of NDW base security, who are expected to get RIF notifications this week. Need a robust strategy to explain the rationale in context to the WNY shooting.

Working on updated RTQ now. Will coordinate with N3, N1, JAG and OGC to ensure we have the correct TPs and messages.

FYSA, I plan to attend the Memorial Service with my family later today, and provide NDW with additional PA support if needed.

Vr,
(b)(6)

I share his concern. Have BEEN sharing it.

The IG report is not the story. Right now it's that the radios didn't work, that we had too few guards on duty, that a gate was locked shut and that we sent a tactical team home before they even got on scene.

The story is that we are incompetent.

If we can beat that back -- or any of it -- we need to do so now, today. And keep doing it. I've been saying this since the undermanning thing first came up. And I still don't have an answer.

(b)(6), USN

Chief of Information

(b)(6)

O: 703-697-7391

C: (b)(6)

H: (b)(6)

Follow me @chinfo

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 08:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CHINFO
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Admiral,

Will expand the RTQs ASAP based on your guidance below. My original intent was to put a general statement on the streets, while waiting for further SECNAV/DOD guidance on what can be said.

As you may know, (b)(6) is VERY adamant about getting our voice out there ASAP tomorrow, as the narrative is creating multiple spin-offs without us (Navy) providing groundtruth or context.

Vr,
(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CHINFO
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 04:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CNIC HQ, N00P
Cc: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: RTQ on Base Security

Thanks (b)(6)